REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 11, 20, 29 and 36 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 5, 12, 24 and 30 have been cancelled. Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-23, 26-29, and 31-36 are pending and under consideration.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 6-22, and 25-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,915,025 issued to Taguchi et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Taguchi"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,525,599 issued to Curran et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Curran"), and further in view of Schneier (Applied Cryptography: Second Edition). This rejection is respectfully traversed. In addition, the Office Action rejects claims 5 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Taguchi, Curran and Schneier and in further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,706,445 issued to Milhaupt et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Milhaupt"). Finally, the Office Action rejects claims 4 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Taguchi, Curran and Schneier and in further in view of IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin 19800601 (hereinafter referred as "IBM").

Claim 1 recites "an internal circuit comprising... a CPU executing programs, **said CPU is supplied with a first clock** and executes the programs synchronously with the supplied first clock" (emphasis added) at lines 2-4 and

> said internal circuit further comprises a ciphering section interposed at an entrance to an external side of said internal circuit ... **said ciphering section is supplied with a second clock** and performs ciphering synchronously with the supplied second clock and a clock supply section for supplying a first clock at a higher speed than a speed of the first clock supplied to said CPU, to said ciphering section

(emphasis added) at lines 15-22. Thus, both a "first clock" and a "second clock" are recited in claim 1. The Office Action relied on Milhaupt to teach "reducing the clock rate to the processor during times when the processor is not being used" (page 11, lines 17-18). Nothing has been cited in Milhaupt or the remaining prior art of record, that teaches or suggests *more than one clock* operating within a internal circuit.

Therefore, claim 1 as well as claims 2-4, 6-10 and claim 18, which depend therefrom, are patentably distinguishable over Taguchi, Curran, Schneier, IBM and Milhaupt because the combinations thereof relied on in the Office Action fail to teach or suggest a "CPU [that] is

supplied with a first clock" and a "ciphering section [that] is supplied with a second clock" as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections over these claims is requested.

According to the foregoing, claims 5 and 24 have been cancelled and thereby rendering the rejection of those claims moot.

Claim 20 recites "a CPU executing programs and is supplied with a first clock and executes the programs synchronously with the supplied first clock" at lines 2-3 and

> a ciphering section interposed at an entrance to an external side of the integrated circuit ... said ciphering section is supplied with a second clock and conducts ciphering synchronously with the supplied second clock and operates with a clock at a higher speed than a speed of the first clock with which said CPU operates.

at lines 14-20. For the reasons discussed above, it is submitted that claim 20 as well as claims 21-23 and 25-28, which depend therefrom, are patentably distinguishable over Taguchi, Curran, Schneier, IBM and Milhaupt because the combinations thereof relied on the Office Action fail to teach or suggest a "CPU [that] is supplied with a first clock" and a "ciphering section [that] is supplied with a second clock" as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections over these claims is requested.

Claim 11 recites

> said internal circuit has information rewrite means for ciphering and rewriting at least part of the information stored in said external memory in a predetermined initialization operation ... and said predetermined initialization operation is an initialization operation when the apparatus is first powered on

in the last five lines. In contrast, Taguchi teaches "[u]sing the time management table 59, the time management means manages the life of each of the keys used and the time that has elapsed since the key in question was last updated" in column 14, lines 58-61 and not an "predetermined initialization operation [that] is an initialization operation when the apparatus is first powered on" as recited in claim 11. Therefore, claim 11 as well as claims 12-19, which depend therefrom, are patentably distinguishable over Taguchi, Curran and Schneier. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections over these claims is requested.

Claim 29 recites:

> the integrated circuit includes information rewrite means for ciphering and rewriting at least part of the information stored in said external memory in a predetermined initialization operation, to thereby prevent illicit access to the internal memory via the external memory and said predetermined initialization operation is an initialization operation when the apparatus is first powered on

in the last five lines. For the reasons discussed above for claim 11, it is submitted that claim 29 as well as claims 30-35, which depend therefrom, are patentably distinguishable over Taguchi, Curran and Schneier. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections over these claims is requested.

Claim 36 recites "wherein the internal circuit comprises ... a predetermined initialization operation that is performed when the apparatus is first powered on" at lines 11-13. For the reasons discussed above for claim 11, it is submitted that claim 36 is patentably distinguishable over Taguchi, Curran and Schneier. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection over claim 36 is requested.

Summary

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-23, 26-29, and 31-36 are pending and under consideration. It is respectfully submitted that none of the references taken alone or in combination disclose the present claimed invention.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: December 7, 2007

By: _____
David E. Moore
Registration No. 59,047

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501